



September 19, 2016 | 9:00 – 11:20 am
10 Park Plaza | Conference Rooms 5 and 6
(directly behind the security desk on the 2nd floor)

MEETING SUMMARY

Action items

ALL – Approve July meeting summary by COB Thursday September 22

ALL – Provide feedback on public survey and discussion groups plan by Friday September 23

CTPS – Send a clarification of the assumptions used for signalized intersection optimization to municipalities and others who are interested

CTPS – Send out PM peak analysis to group

MAPC – work with Cities and Working Group members to develop list of likely plans that are not in no-build but that the group would like to include in the Alternative 1 alternate land-use scenario.

CTPS/CBI – reconcile CIP with LRTP to make sure most up-to-date projects are in the no-build

CBI – update infrastructure and policy/TDM options lists to remove any duplicates, add new suggestions from group, and add clarifications where necessary

2030 and 2040 no-build conditions

Mark Abbott from CTPS presented an analysis of the no-build conditions for vehicle transit for 2030 and 2040. He clarified that the no-build analysis included only the plans that are in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The analysis used Boston MPO's regional transportation model to forecast future trips, the Synchro model to analyze intersections in the Routes 16, 99, and 28 corridors, and Transmodeler to simulate conditions on I-93 and analyze traffic flow. The presentation focused on conditions for AM peak hours. CTPS planned to distribute an analysis of PM peak hours to the Working Group and present an analysis of alternative modes at a subsequent meeting.

The analysis forecasted increased vehicle trips, vehicle miles and vehicle hours traveled, greater intersection volumes and delays, and more failing intersections and failing segments on I-93. Generally, changes in these indicators were reflected in increases from existing conditions to 2030 forecasts, as well as from 2030 to 2040 forecasts. (For more detail on results of the no-build modeling, see the presentations provided by CTPS.)

Mr. Abbott clarified that CTPS' analysis assumed signal optimization for signalized intersections for 2030 and 2040 forecasts, and that it also optimized signalization for existing conditions to make the comparison more consistent. Working group members asked to see clarification of

the assumptions going into signalization optimization for both existing and future conditions, which CTPS agreed to provide. Group members emphasized that prioritization for alternative modes and pedestrian access may need to be accounted for and that optimization for vehicles only might not accurately represent existing or future conditions. Working Group members also stressed that substantial investments would be required for all cities to optimize signalization as was forecast in the no-build conditions. Bob DeSalvio of Wynn Boston Harbor clarified that intersections impacted by the Wynn development would be optimized.

Jim Gillooly of Boston clarified that the plan for Sullivan Square in the no-build scenario included no grade separation, but that group members were interested to test alternative scenarios, including grade separation, in the modeling process. He requested that improvements to Causeway Street be included in the no-build model.

The group discussed several questions about traffic conditions on I-93. Participants posed the question whether the HOV lane on the interstate was the most effective use of space and whether an alternative allocation might be considered. Bob Frey of MassDOT clarified that the HOV lane was a federal regulatory requirement. Brad Rawson of Somerville asked whether a regular assessment of the performance of the HOV lane was required as a component of regulation. David Mohler of MassDOT and Mr. Abbott clarified that the model accounted for increased trips as a result of added capacity, but that because the model assumed trips were purpose-driven, it would not assume an increased number of total trips in the system as a result of added capacity.

Alternative 1: alternate land use scenario

Eric Bourassa of MAPC described that Alternative 1 would model an alternative to the no-build scenario with more growth in the urban core and less in the suburbs, while still holding the regional totals constant with the constraints in the no-build scenario. MAPC planned to report to the group on this modeling effort in the next meeting and planned to contact the three cities to incorporate their likely infrastructure and development plans that were not included in the no-build scenario into its analysis.

Components and packages of early alternatives

The group reviewed the compilation of components that group members had submitted for consideration to model in the alternative scenarios. The group discussed the need for alternatives to be varied enough to consider different options and also discrete enough to be able to track the influences on the model. Mr. Bourassa reported that MAPC was researching inputs to model various transportation demand model (TDM) components such as flexible schedules and employer-funded shuttle services. MAPC and CTPS staff recommended to the group that it package TDM components in an alternative but separate parking policies in order to better distinguish parking policy impacts. MAPC staff will contact cities to determine which policies are of interest to model. Group members requested clarification of planned improvements to the Orange Line to inform decisions about modeling infrastructure improvements. The group concurred that while factors such as enforceability and cost would

ultimately need to be considered at the phase of making recommendations, infrastructure and policy components should not be disqualified at this stage based on these criteria.

Public Engagement

Carri Hulet of CBI updated the group on plans for a public meeting in early November, discussion groups with relevant organizations interested in mobility issues, an online survey, and a public engagement-focused website. Group members provided feedback on the survey draft and discussion group plan and discussed the options for dates and venues for the public meeting. Group members also emphasized the need to plan carefully how to describe the complexity of this project to the public and referenced what could be learned from other successful public meetings.

Closing

Mr. Field reviewed next steps for the group and adjourned the meeting at 11:20 AM.